PHILIP MORRIS
INCORPORATED

LAW DEPARTMENT
PATENT SECTION

P.O. BOX 26583, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

(804) 274-2822
TELEX 827339

January 29, 1982

Mr. John H. Bass
Reddie & Grose
16 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8PL England

RE: Venezuela Application 944-80
PM 868 Venezuela Your file 23241

Dear John:

In our U.S. Application version of this case on bispyrazyl ethanes etc., Claim 26 is a product claim so that the selection for a basic process claim would presumably be between claims 27 and 28, the final two. If this is correct, we would choose claim 28 which reads on the process for making the unsymmetrical products, and is thus more general. This relates to Claims 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24. Claim 27 is very important also, and if it is not possible to combine the two in some way, it should be considered whether both embodiments can be salvaged by divisional filing or the like.

Claim 13 (in the U.S. version) is more important to us than Claim 14 if that choice is required.

As I believe I pointed out before, the second structural formula in Example XIII should be corrected.

Very truly yours,

Les

G. Esler Inskeep

bjm

cc: T. Osdene
E. Sanders

2026446123

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/nxnj0000